

RELIGIOUS INQUIRER.

COME NOW, AND LET US REASON TOGETHER.—ISAIAH 1. 18.

PUBLISHED BY AN ASSOCIATION OF GENTLEMEN.—EDITED BY REV. JOHN BISBE, JR.

VOL. III.]

HARTFORD, (CONN.) OCTOBER 2, 1824.

[NO. 24.]

ESTABLISHED CLERGY OF ENGLAND.

Extracts from "*The Black Book; or, Corruption Unmasked.*"

"Twenty-six bishops, 700 dignitaries, and about 400 non-resident incumbents, enjoy nearly the whole ecclesiastical revenues, amounting to betwixt 5 and 6,000,000 pounds, and averaging about 5000 pounds [22,222 dollars] a year each.

"And for what service? what duties do they perform? what benefit do the people derive from their labours? The bishops ordain the priests; sometimes visit their dioceses; sometimes preach; and this we believe is the extent of their performances, and which, in our opinion, amounts to nearly nothing. Then, as to the dignitaries, they perform still less. Let any one visit the cathedral or collegiate churches; go into St. Paul's, Westminster Abbey, or Yorkminster, for instance; and see what is doing in these places. No service is performed which interests the public. Persons may be found admiring the stone and mortar; but the vicars choral, the priest-vicars, the chanters, or sub-chanters, or fifth or sixth canons, are very little regarded; and as to the dignitaries themselves, why they are never to be seen; many of them probably reside some hundred miles off, in more pleasant parts of the country, enjoying the amusements of the chase, or whiling away their time at card-tables, or watering places. Then, as to the non-resident incumbents, it must be admitted, at least, they are *sinecurists*, whose duty is performed, and for which they receive the salary, by deputy. Thus, it appears, that these three classes, without performing any duties, absorb almost the entire revenue of the church. The only labouring bees in the establishment, are the curates, who receive a very small portion of its emoluments. In a parliamentary paper, ordered to be printed on the 16th May, 1817, containing the diocesan returns relative to the number and stipends of curates, we find that for the year 1814, out of 4405 individuals of that class, there were 1657 with incomes only betwixt 40*l.* and 60*l.* per annum. Supposing their average income 100*l.* which is higher than the bishops, by the 36th of George III. had authority to raise them, their share of the revenue of the church only amounts to 440,500*l.* Yet it is this class which performs nearly the whole service of the established church.

"The clergy of the Established Church in Ireland consists of 4 archbishops, 18 bishops, 300 dignitaries, and about 1200 parochial incumbents. Their revenues, from the prodigious extension of tillage within the last thirty years, have augmented enormously.

"The present value of the estates belonging to the bishoprics, if they were now out of lease, would be immense. Mr. Wakefield, from the estimate of well-informed persons, has given the value of a few as follows:—The Primacy, 140,000*l.*; Derry, 120,000*l.*; Kilmore, 100,000*l.*; Waterford, 70,000*l.*; Clogher, 100,000*l.*—Vol. ii. p. 470.

"The livings in the gift of the Archbishop of Cashel are worth 35,000*l.* per annum; those in the gift of the Bishop of Cloyne, 50,000*l.*; of Cork, 30,000*l.*; and of Fern, 30,000*l.* Killaloe has 109 benefices, many worth 1500*l.* per annum. In the Bishopric of Cloyne one living is worth 3000*l.*, one worth 2000*l.*, and three worth 1500*l.* each.—The Deanery of Down, in the year 1790, was worth only

2000*l.* per annum; it now lets for 3700*l.* The Rectory of Middleton, in the county of Cork, in 1785, yielded scarcely 800*l.* per annum; at present it produces upwards of 2800*l.* 'A living of 500*l.*' says Mr. Wakefield, 'is but a middling one in Ireland, and any thing beneath it is considered very low.'

"Notwithstanding these enormous revenues, a large proportion of the bishops, dignitaries, and incumbents, are absenteees, expending the immense incomes wrung from the soil and labour of Ireland, in the dissipated and fashionable circles of Bath and London. The families of many of the prelates reside constantly in England, and the only duty performed by the absentee bishop is to cross the water during the summer months, just take a look at the metropolitan palace, and then return to spend the remainder of the year in this country. Mr. Ensor, in his work on Ecclesiastical Establishments, says, 'The Primate of all Ireland, though in the summer of 1807 he enforced the duty of residence to his clergy, almost immediately after his charge quitted the island.' The late Earl of Bristol, Bishop of Derry, resided twenty years abroad; and during that time received the revenue of his rich diocese, amounting to 240,000*l.* The great primate, Rokeby, resided several years at Bath, and never visited Ireland. Many of the prelates, it appears, are young men, indebted for their valuable dignities solely to family connexion. But what is more extraordinary, some have been in the army and navy, and apparently not intended for the Church. 'One archbishop,' says Mr. Wakefield, 'was, I believe, before his appointment, a lieutenant in the navy; the Dean of Clogher was a member of the Imperial Parliament; and the rector of a valuable benefice was lately an *aid-de-camp* at the Castle.'—Vol. ii. p. 476.

"The tithes by which this spiritual sinecurism is supported, are levied almost entirely on the cattle, pigs, poultry, and potatoes of the Irish cotters. In England, where, in many parts, a man cannot cut a cabbage, pull a carrot, or gather a bunch of grapes, without giving notice to the spiritual locust, the system is sufficiently intolerable; but in Ireland, from the mode of collecting tithes, those evils are aggravated tenfold. The Irish clergy generally employ an agent, called a Proctor, who, immediately before harvest, estimates the barrels of corn, tons of hay, or hundred weight of potatoes, he supposes on the ground, and charging the market price, ascertains the amount to be paid by the owner. The parson sometimes leases the tithes out to the Proctor, at a fixed rent, like a farm; while the latter, who, in that case, is called the middle Proctor, not unfrequently re-lets them to another. In the south, Mr. Wakefield says, the tithe is set out and sold by public auction on the premises. And in Connaught, the same writer found it was customary to call a sale before the harvest, at which the tithe is sold to any person who chooses to collect it.

"Under such a system, it is easy to conceive what the Irish must endure. From the Proctors and middle Proctors, they cannot expect either lenity or indulgence. These men, probably strangers in the parish, have no motives for cultivating the friendship of the people; and having farmed the tithe for a stipulated sum, it is to be expected they will collect it with the utmost rigour, in order to realize the greatest profit from their bargain. The most distressing scenes are sometimes witnessed from their relentless

proceedings. The half-famished cotter, surrounded by a wretched family, clamorous for food, frequently beholds his favourite cow, or the tenth part of the produce of his potatoe garden, carried off to fill the insatiable maw of clerical rapacity. 'I have seen,' says Mr. Wakefield, 'the cow, the favourite cow, driven away, accompanied by the sighs, the tears, and the imprecations of a whole family, who were paddling after, through wet and dirt, to take their last affectionate farewell of this their only benefactor at the pound gate. I have heard, with emotions which I can scarcely describe, deep curses repeated from village to village, as the cavalcade proceeded. I have witnessed the group pass the domain walls of the opulent grazier, whose numerous herds were cropping the most luxuriant pastures, whilst he was secure from any demand for the tithe of their food, looking on with the utmost indifference.'—Vol. ii. p. 466.

"To spare the rich and plunder the poor, is certainly not Christianity; it is more like Church of Englandism, which, by the monstrous union of Church and State, has perverted the pure simple, and charitable faith of Christ into a tremendous engine of political guilt and spiritual extortion. There is, we are assured, plenty of law in Ireland, as well as in this country: there is no wrong, we are told, without a remedy there; the Courts of Justice are open, as the hypocrites say in England, for the punishment of either magisterial or clerical delinquents. All this sounds well on paper, in a Regent's speech, or in a speech of Castlereagh; but it is mere mockery and insult when offered to the victims of legal violence. Law, in both countries, is for those who can pay for it—the rich and not the poor. The poor cotter, oppressed or defrauded by the exaction of the tithe Proctor, to the value of 10*l.* cannot buy a chance of redress in the lottery of the law for less than 60*l.* By victory or defeat he is equally and irremediably ruined. What resource then have men whose possessions probably do not amount to half that sum? None. The way to Courts of Justice, through the impassable barrier of attorneys and lawyers' fees, is over a bridge of gold; and to point out these tribunals for redress either to English or Irish poor, or even to those moderately endowed with this world's wealth, is, in other words, to point out to a man the shortest way by which he may bring himself to the jail, and his family to the workhouse.

"The situation of the London clergy is different from that of the clergy in other parts of the kingdom. In the reign of Henry VIII. continual quarrels were carried on between the citizens and the clergy, relative to their tithes, fees, and other emoluments. To put an end to these disorders, the Act of the 37th Henry VIII. established a commission, with full power to give to their decisions the force of law, if they were enrolled in the Court of Chancery before the first of March, 1545. The same act made their decisions a dead letter if they were not enrolled in the specified manner. Somehow it happened the enrolment never took place; consequently, the decree of the commissioners never was in force. The clergy of the metropolis, however, found their claim for 2*s.* 9*d.* in the pound on this decree. The London *Fire-Act Clergy*, with all the impudence imaginable, commenced their petition of last February, with the following allegation:—"That before the fire of London, in 1666, the incumbents of livings in the city, and the liberties thereof, were entitled, under a decree of commissioners made pursuant to the 37th Henry VIII. to payment, in lieu of tithes, at the rate of 2*s.* 9*d.* in the pound on the rents of the houses, shops, warehouses, and other buildings in their respective parishes."

"This is what the London clergy modestly term their '*ancient rights*.' These '*ancient rights*,' however, have no foundation; the decree on which it is pretended they are founded, never having been enrolled. Two shillings and nine pence in the pound no doubt would yield a very handsome revenue; and the clergy have looked to this claim

with extreme longing, and beheld the increasing wealth and population of the city, with feelings something similar to those ascribed by Milton to Satan, when contemplating, with malign eye, the happiness of our first parents in the garden of Eden. An assessment of 1*s.* in the pound, as stated by the City Tithe Committee, would, in the smallest and poorest parishes, yield an income of 500*l.* a year, and an assessment of 2*s.* 9*d.* would raise the lowest living to 1400*l.* a year.

"Though the decree emanating from the 37th Henry VIII. had never any validity, it has formed the principle on which the assessment has been raised for the maintenance of the metropolitan clergy. The clergy, indeed, in no instance exact the 2*s.* 9*d.* but generally content themselves with 2*s.* 1*s.* 9*d.* or 1*s.*—or, in short, any thing they can obtain; insisting, however, at the same time, on their extreme forbearance in thus generously foregoing their '*ancient rights*,' which never existed. Even the 37th Henry never intended to vest in the clergy the 2*s.* 9*d.* for their exclusive maintenance, but also for relieving the poor & repairing the edifice of the church. This they have always kept out of sight; the parishioners apparently acquiesced in their pretended rights; and it was only owing to the ill-timed rapacity of the *Fire-Act Clergy* which led to the notable discovery, that there was, in fact, no legal provision for the maintenance of the London clergy. Of the proceedings of the *Fire-Act Clergy* and their rapacious claims it may be worth while to give some account.

"After the 37th Henry it appears, without any legal right, the clergy throughout the metropolis were maintained by a certain pound-rate levied on the rental of buildings in their respective parishes. This practice continued till the dreadful fire in 1666 laid the greater part of the city in ashes, burning down or damaging 85 parish churches. After this catastrophe, the legislature enacted that some of the parishes destroyed should be united; that only 51 churches should be rebuilt; and that the ministers of those churches should, in lieu of their former allowance, receive certain fixed sums, levied by an equal pound rate on the houses. This was the 22d and 23d Charles II. termed the *Fire-Act*. The clergy subject to the provisions of this act appear to have been perfectly satisfied, till the effects of the fire began to disappear, the rents of the houses to rise, and the city to get rich again. Then it was that our reverend gentlemen became discontented: they saw, with grudging eyes, the increasing wealth of the city, of which their fixed stipends would not allow them to participate; they talked unceasingly of their former pound-rate, of their '*ancient rights*,' and at length determined, in good earnest, to apply to parliament.

"In consequence of this application, parliament made valuable additions to their salaries; the lowest incomes were raised to 200*l.* a year, and many of the larger parishes, nearly, if not quite, to 600*l.* a year, exclusive of surplice-fees and other valuable emoluments. This augmentation, to all reasonable men, appeared quite sufficient: not so to the clergy. In 1817 they applied for a further augmentation. This application was refused. In 1818 they came forward a third time, with their famous petition of the 4th February, filled with grievous lamentations about the loss of their '*ancient rights*.' The bubble now burst. Parliament, disgusted with the rapacity of these '*sturdy beggars*,' determined to refer their petition to a committee. It was soon discovered their '*ancient rights*' had no foundation; that they never were entitled to 2*s.* 9*d.* on the rental, or any part of it; that with the 37th Henry VIII. which they had foisted into their petition, they had nothing to do, except it were to exhibit the craving and rapacious spirit which actuated them."

"Various other disclosures were made. Of the thirty-five poor clergymen who had signed the petition, none of them, on an average, was receiving less than 500*l.* a year. Twenty-five out of the number were pluralists, and not a few of them the fattest pluralists of the profession. Some

of the incumbents received annually 1200*l.* 1500*l.* and even 2000*l.* while they did not pay their curates more than 60*l.* 70*l.* or 80*l.* a year.* Instead of residing in the parsonage-house, among the parishioners, the parsonage-houses of many were let to the merchants and manufacturers for counting-houses and warehouses, for which they received exorbitant rents of 200*l.* or 300*l.* a year. Some of them were canons at St. Paul's, some were precentors, prebendaries, and held other dignified situations in cathedral and collegiate churches.

"Had not the *Fire-Act Clergy* been the most unreasonable and rapacious men breathing, there is little doubt but they would have considered the emoluments arising from these numerous preferments sufficient. But the wealth of India would not satisfy the cravings of this profession. Some of them, it is said, were base enough to lay in wait for the Members going to the House, while their petition was pending, and beseech them to support their claims for an increase in their stipends. It reminds us of the monks of St. Swithin's. These gluttons had thirteen meals a day. Hume relates, that they threw themselves prostrate in the mire before Henry II. and with doleful lamentations complained that the Bishop of Winchester had cut off three meals a day. 'How many has he left?' said the king. 'Ten,' replied the disconsolate monks. 'I myself,' said Henry, 'have only three, and I enjoin the Bishop to reduce you to the same number.'

"The emoluments of the London clergy are far greater than those of the clergy in the country. Some of the livings we know are very valuable. For instance, there is the rectory of St. George's Hanover-square, held by Dr. Hodgson, and in the gift of the Bishop of London, worth about 4000*l.* per annum. There is the living of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate-street, held by the Rev. Dr. Mant, probably worth 3000*l.* The rectory of St. Andrew's, Holborn, in the gift of the Duke of Buccleugh, and held by the Rev. Mr. Clare, is nearly as valuable. The living of St. Giles's held by the Right Rev. Bishop of Chichester, is another valuable rectory. We could enumerate others, but these must suffice.

"In considering the incomes of the metropolitan clergy it must be remembered, that they have many other sources of emolument besides their benefices. St. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster Abbey have many valuable dignities, equal in value to good fat livings, and which are shared among the London ecclesiastics. Then there are the appointments in the Royal Chapels, public libraries and museums, and the salaries they receive as ushers, masters, &c. in the numerous and wealthy charitable foundations, and which altogether must make their incomes immense."

*"The incumbents in London, we are told, are careful to select curates whose abilities are not likely to eclipse their own. Some, it is said, do not stop here, but actually make *personal appearance* an object of consideration, always taking care to choose a curate of a less imposing figure than themselves. Hence many parishes, in order to have a tolerable discourse once on a Sunday, and a decent looking man in the rostrum, go to the expense of paying an evening lecturer of their own choice."

FOR THE RELIGIOUS INQUIRER.

COPY OF A LETTER TO JOHN V. N. YATES, Esq. SECRETARY OF STATE,—ALBANY, (N. Y.)

Albany, July 18th 1822.

RESPECTED SIR.—Yours of this date I have this moment read. I have to regret that you have, as I think *travelled out of the record*. The proposition which I wished to maintain, is, that sin is not an *infinite evil*. On this, as

I before observed, depends the doctrine of endless misery, and on a failure of proof that sin *is* infinite, the doctrine must fall.

I took up the position in my letter, because you had noticed it in conversation, & because it is the fruitful source of all our errors in theology, or nearly so. I hoped indeed to stick close to one point, until that was settled, but as you have chosen to shift the discussion from particulars to generals, I shall endeavour to follow you.—I readily admit, that the Bible is the legitimate source of faith and practice, and that the province of *reason* is to determine the true sense of scripture. Let us then come to the point.

The scriptures declare, that God is good to all, and that his tender mercies are over all his works. Where do we find the *limitation* of which you speak? Is there a limitation to this expression?

The parable of the rich man and Lazarus has nothing to do with *character*. It is not a *personal*, but a *national* parable & is not in the least applicable to the subject. The two denounced against Judas befel him, and there the matter ended. But he is not the *son of perdition*, as you probably infer. As to the pains inflicted on *devils*, as you say, for one transgression, I am entirely ignorant.—If our Saviour says any thing about the *last judgment*, it is not within the circle of my knowledge. I am, sir, fully persuaded of two things: first, that the language of the scriptures is intended to convey ideas, and that your mind is not so obtuse that you would, in any other possible case, enter a demurrer to the explicit promises of the remission of sin, and the final holiness and consequent happiness of all men. From the premises, the conclusion is irresistible. "God is Love." "God, who is RICH IN MERCY, for his GREAT LOVE wherewith he loved us, even when we were DEAD IN SIN." Here we see what the Pharisees abominated—"the FRIEND of publicans and sinners." But God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." If the object of the mission of Christ into the world, were to recover men from the darkness, ignorance, and disobedience of Satan, to the knowledge of the true God;—if he gave his life to seal the truth of his mission;—if he loved the members of his body to the end;—if all things were given into his hand, and if all that the Father gave him shall be raised in glory;—where, how, by what rule or law, is a solitary soul of the human race, to remain interminably miserable?

Now the question recurs; "Is sin an infinite evil?" We read of the utter destruction of the Devil and all his works. Of the end of sin; that death the last enemy shall be destroyed without the possibility of a resurrection; for there shall be NO MORE DEATH." Where is now the limitation?

Respecting endless punishment, we can, positively say, that it would be *unjust*. A "thus saith the Lord" is our warrant for this assertion, and the Bible no where contains the threat of a *never ending* state of misery. The prophet says of God, that he is "a just God and a Saviour." His justice demands the reconciliation of sinners. But Isaiah gives a better reason for the reconciliation of sinners, and the cessation of suffering, than all the doctors in christendom can offer to rebut his argument. "For I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth, for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made."

That men sin, and suffer in consequence, is an undeniable fact. Sin and suffering are inseparably connected. "Man was made subject to vanity, not willingly but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope." In hope of what? not of endless misery, surely; but, "in hope of eternal life, which God, who cannot lie, promised before the world began."

But this vanity, this sin, is to be destroyed. It mars our happiness. It was therefore that Christ should be called Jesus, because he should save his people FROM THEIR SINS. This is the salvation of God; it is the doctrine for which we contend. We therefore teach the restoration of

all intelligent beings to holiness and happiness. We believe the time will come, when the law of God (love) will be written in every heart; when the people will all be taught of God, and of course, all be righteous. When the outcasts shall be gathered in; when all flesh shall see the salvation of God; when every knee shall bow to the sceptre of the Prince of Peace, and God be all in all.

If, on earth, "pain and punishment are very unequal," we are not certain of ascertaining it. We judge by sight. It is not ours to probe the human heart. It is sufficient that the prophet states from the mouth of the Lord, that his ways are "equal." I doubt the propriety of assuming a proposition, and then descanting upon it, as if it were a fact. The scriptures inform us, that God is a "just God and a Saviour," and that with him is no variableness, neither shadow of turning. If the wisdom from above is "without partiality and without hypocrisy," let us beware how we attribute a partiality to God, which would disgrace a Nero.

The idea of a temporary punishment hereafter is gratuitous on your part. It is no part of my statement, and you therefore mistake, in ascribing to me a doctrine savouring of popish purgatory. As to the "ministers of divine wrath," and a preparation for heaven by any retributive system, they are not to be laid at my door. I believe that the destruction of the devil and his works will emancipate men from the dominion of moral evil, and that the remission of sin, and the teaching of God's spirit, will lead to universal holiness and happiness.

We believe not in driving men to heaven by the terrors of endless fire and brimstone. We would draw them by the cords of love—love stronger than death. We grant, indeed, that "every man shall be rewarded according to his works." As certain as we sow to the flesh, we shall of the flesh reap corruption. *What* we sow, we shall assuredly reap; and *where* we sow, is the surest place to look for a crop. That the terrors of hell do not influence us to love God or men, is evident from the cause not agreeing with the presumed effect. Love begets love. "We love him, because he first loved us." "Perfect love casteth out fear." Punishment, corresponding with crime, and treading on its heels, is of more avail than all the terrors of an imaginary hell in another world.

"Death at a distance we but slightly fear,
He brings his terrors as he draws more near."

You state that "the denunciations of our Saviour show, that after death cometh the judgment, and that scripture no where assures us, that that judgment is merely temporal, and not eternal." As the scriptures do not thus read within my knowledge, I must ask to be excused for doubting the authority of this quotation. What we read, sounding something like this language, is a very different affair, and may, at a future time, receive some attention.

My closing notice, which takes a glimpse of the doctrine of the trinity, was not intended as sarcastic. And never would I willingly injure the feelings of any man, by speaking lightly of those things, which to him appear sacred. But I think with freedom, and have generally brought my ideas to light in the best manner, by calling things by their right names. It was therefore in strong language that I touched on the subject, and under the full belief, that error, to be seen in all its deformity, should be stripped naked.

Some Universalists are Trinitarians, but they are not our ablest defenders. I commenced on that system, but its defects were frequently thorns in my side. But on either side, whether Unitarian or Trinitarian, the love of God must be the foundation on which rests the fabric of man's salvation, and while the scriptures overflow with the doctrine, no defender of the sentiment need fear the event of an examination. Truth alone should be the object of pursuit, and love to God and man should tune every heart in songs of praise to him who alone is worthy.

Yours respectfully,
MAYHEW.

FOR THE RELIGIOUS INQUIRER.

A MISTAKE CORRECTED.

It will be recollected by some, who attended the services of the 18th and 19th ult. at the Universalist Church, in this city, that Br. Mitchell noticed the want of proper marginal readings, in the American Family Bibles. This remark was expressed rather vaguely. The stereotype plates made by the Collinses, New-York, are, I believe, alone in this omission. Mr. Carey's standard Bible is believed to be as perfect as the European, whether English, Irish, or Scotch.

The imperfect editions of the Bible, occasioned by this omission, ought to remain in the hands of the publishers. One set of the plates is owned at Brattleborough, Vt. and others may probably be found in different places, besides New-York. It is believed that all the Bible plates cast by the Collinses, are thus imperfect.

These remarks are made with the sole view of being useful. I much regret the occurrence, which makes it necessary to cry down any publication, and more especially that of the Bible; but the public benefit is a paramount duty, and I dare not decline it.

To test the value of the marginal readings, let the reader examine, as a specimen, 1 Cor. xi. 10, and determine which has the preference, the text or the marginal reading.—The text examined by Br. Mitchell, in old editions, reads agreeable to the marginal reading contended for by him as the true reading, and which a little examination will satisfy is the only correct version.

MENTOR.

RELIGIOUS INQUIRER.

SATURDAY, October 2, 1824.

NOTES ON THE SCRIPTURES.

The word translated punishment in the forty-sixth verse of the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew, is *Kolasis*, and originally signified *amputatio arborum luxuriantium*, the pruning of luxuriant trees. In process of time it was used figuratively for correction or chastisement, and it is to be thus understood in the verse we have mentioned. The word from which *Kolasis* is derived, and the meaning attached to it by the Greeks, clearly determine its sense, and prove that it was used to express that infliction by which men are made better. To show that we have rightly explained this word, we quote two celebrated critics. Grotius says, that the kind of punishment which tends to the improvement of the criminal, is what the philosophers called among other things, *Kolasis*, or *chastisement*. Wyttenbach, who follows Grotius, says, that God, in the infliction of sufferings, has three ends in view; the first of which, is the correction of the offender, in order to his future amendment. And that the Greeks frequently gave to such sufferings the name, *Kolasis*. That the scripture writers employed this word in this sense, may not only be inferred from its original signification, and the usage of the Greeks, but from a consideration of the passages in which they have used it. No believer in endless misery supposes the reprobate suffer it in this life; but John implies that this punishment (*Kolasis*) is experienced in this life, when he says, there is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear; because fear hath torment, (*Kolasis*.) As perfect

love casts out the fear which produces this torment, and as this torment is endured in this life, we may fairly conclude this punishment is limited. It cannot be replied that it is called endless, and that consequently it can have no limitation; for if we have shown that *Kolasis* means a corrective infliction, it would be the grossest solecism to talk about an endless chastisement. The argument for unending suffering therefore derives no support from this word, (*Kolasis*) as it originally and metaphorically signified a corrective discipline. The idea attached to the verse we are examining appears to be this; the righteous, or those who accept the gospel, shall go into age-lasting life or enjoyment, and the wicked, or those who reject it, into age-lasting punishment, or correction.

REASONS FOR BELIEVING IN UNIVERSALISM.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 182.]

3. Christ tasted death for all.

The scriptures so unequivocally affirm that Christ gave himself a ransom for all, that he tasted death for every man, and that he is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, that few classes of christians have doubted the universality of the atonement, though many have questioned its universal efficacy. The first inquiry is, for what purpose did Christ give himself, or for what object did he die? The apostle informs us that it was to reconcile men to God. *Now then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you, in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.* Without ascertaining the process by which this reconciliation is to be effected, let us inquire in the second place, how extensive was the reconciliation for which Christ gave himself? the answer of the scripture is very explicit, as he died for those he came to reconcile, and he died for all. If then Christ designed to reconcile all men to God by his death, he must save them all from their sins, for in this way only can he reunite them to their Father in heaven. But that no doubt might rest on any mind, John declares that the Father sent the Son, to be the Saviour of the world, and that he is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world.

If Christ did not intend to reconcile all, why did he taste death for them? it cannot be replied that he died for the sin of the world, to make a great exhibition of God's wrath against it, and thereby died for each man, that he might comply with certain terms, and be saved; for there is a broad difference between dying for sin in the abstract, that any one, or no one may be saved, and dying for each individual, that his salvation may be certain. If Christ simply died for sin in the abstract, that God's law might be honored, and man forgiven, it necessarily follows that he died for no one; so that this answer, instead of removing the difficulty, contradicts the scriptures. In truth, unless Christ desired the salvation of those for whom he gave himself, he could not have died for them as he did; for we are assured that it was by the grace or favor of

God that he tasted death for every man; hence it must have been his good pleasure that all should be freed from sin, as he and his Father have but one heart. If any one can imagine that Christ suffered all the miseries of this life, and all the pains of crucifixion, without knowing whether they would effect something or nothing, he must believe him a wild enthusiast. And if he believe God sent him without any definite view, in reference to the salvation of any man, he must conclude that God had a specific and certain object in the creation of the natural sun, but an uncertain and indefinite purpose in sending Jesus, the Sun of righteousness. From this consideration of the argument it follows, that if Christ died for sin in the abstract, he died for no individual in particular; and if he died for no one, that he will not save any, as he will not save those for whom he did not die.

If Christ intended to reconcile all to God by his death, what will prevent the completion of his purpose? should it be answered, that man's obstinate non-compliance with the terms of salvation may shut out some from the enjoyment of heaven, it is replied, God has never given man power to overthrow his own government, or to check the execution of his will. But if God sent Christ to be the Saviour of the world, knowing at the same time, that man's inveteracy in sin would in a great number of instances, defeat all his exertions to save him, he must have sent him to effect impossibilities. If he then came to benefit all, he must either change, or find himself unequal to the undertaking, or all will ultimately realize the advantage he designed to impart. His immutability is secured by the declaration, that he is the same yesterday, to day, and forever; consequently no person's salvation is endangered by his change of purpose. The Father has given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as he has given him; hence no deficiency of power can defeat the benevolent purpose of his soul, in a single instance. Should the trite and superficial objection be made, that man cannot be happy by compulsion, it is answered, that the power given to Christ is not physical, but moral, and that in yielding to its influence, man feels no more reluctance than the ice, which melts by the heat of the sun. The ice would never dissolve, unless there should be a certain degree of heat, and when that degree is produced, its fluidity is certain; but should not that degree be produced, might we not reasonably conclude that God did not intend to melt it? So in the moral world, should not God proportion the light to the darkness he wishes to dissipate, or the warmth to the cold he desires to remove, how could we discover wisdom or sincerity in him? it may be said that we should concur, or co-operate with the spirit of God, and that without this concurrence, or co-operation, nothing can be effected; but it is answered, there can be no more co-operation when the heart is softened, than there is when the mind is enlightened; and that in the latter case, a person has nothing to do, but to receive and weigh the evidence, and to yield to its power.

From the arguments already adduced, this conclusion may be fairly drawn, that it is God's will that all men should be saved; that his counsel shall stand, and that he will do all his pleasure; that Christ and the Father have one will, that he consequently desires the salvation of all men, as he tasted death for all, gave himself a ransom for all, is the propitiation for the sins of all, & as he shall see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied. When God's designs never fail in the material world, what reason have we to believe that they will fail in the moral world; as he has made as positive and as explicit promises concerning the salvation of all men, as he has concerning day and night, seed time and harvest. Now people might as well question God's faithfulness in sending rain, heat and light in their proper season, as doubt his sending his spirit, to melt the hearts and enlighten the understandings of the children of men. The darkness and cold of winter are as great obstructions to the advance of spring, as the blindness and obduracy of man are to his final happiness. If then God be faithful to his promises that concern light and darkness, seed-time and harvest, and if he inform us that the soul is infinitely more valuable than the body, will he show that he estimates one more highly than the other, by taking the best care, yea, the only care of that which is simply a handful of animated dust, a lump of breathing clay?

RESULT OF THE COUNCIL OF CASTILE.

"The Dutch offered Charles II. of Spain, to make the Tagus navigable as far as Lisbon, at their own expense, provided he would suffer them to exact, for a certain number of years, a stipulated duty on merchandise, which should pass that way. After a sage deliberation, the Council of Castile returned this remarkable answer;

If it had pleased God to make these rivers navigable, the intervention of human industry would not have been necessary; as they are not so already, it does not appear that Providence intended them to be so. Such an undertaking would be seemingly to violate the decrees of Heaven, and to attempt the amendment of these apparent imperfections, visible in his works."—*Clarke's Letters on the Spanish nation—quoted by the Translator of Herodotus.*

REMARKS.

We should scarcely believe, that in the present day, people would reason in this manner, were we not constantly presented with arguments of this description. Sage divines and others contend, that if God intended to save all mankind, he would have done it already; but that as he has not accomplished it, we should violate his decrees, and attempt the amendment of his government, by preaching it, or by striving to convince men of its reasonableness, of its truth. But should any one talk in this manner about the natural world, declaring that every alteration and improvement effected by man, was an implied censure on the primitive arrangements of the Creator, his folly would be apparent in this age. Why should not his folly be equally apparent, when he asks, if all are to be saved, what is the need of Bibles, Sabbaths, and preaching? God has

invariably worked by means, except in cases in which he has wrought miracles, and they are just as necessary in the moral as in the physical world. Had he designed the salvation of no one, means would be unnecessary; but had he determined on the salvation of one, all would grant the necessity of means, why then are they not necessary for the salvation of all? Should any contend, that as sin and misery exist in this world, we have no reason to suppose they will not in another; the argument would prove too much, or it would prove nothing; for as each person is a sinner in this life, we may safely conclude each one will be in a future, or that the argument is sophistical. If the present world furnish a true specimen of the coming, the salvation of any is a mere illusion, as the future existence is only a continuation of the present.

That this reasoning is self-destructive, may be easily seen, if this statement be admitted, by considering, that if God ever designed to finish sin in any individual, he has done it already, but as he has terminated sin in no one, it is morally certain he never will. As this is the legitimate consequence of this argument against salvation, it involves those who bring it as deeply in ruin, as those against whom they urge it. If the Creator of the earth intended it should undergo no alterations, either by the hand of man, or by the operation of the elements, he has been strangely defeated; and if he have saved all men now, as much as he ever will, it is astonishing that he promises incorruption and bliss through a Saviour. But if he intend to save any from sin and consequent misery, does it logically follow that the work is already effected? if not, there is no force in the remark that is frequently made, that if the benevolence of God do not prevent suffering in this world, there is no reason to believe it will in the next. But if this objection to God's universal grace be true, every one, who thinks he may finally enter heaven, indulges the most fallacious expectation; for as God's benevolence does not free him from sin now, he may rest assured it never will. If sin were an ultimate object in the administration of God, his benevolence could remove it in no future time; but as the scriptures declare that transgression is to be finished, sin to be ended, and reconciliation made for iniquity, we may safely affirm it is not an ultimate object; as after its destruction, everlasting righteousness is to be brought in, and then the mystery of God is finished. But should we grant that sin, or moral evil is an ultimate object in the purpose of Heaven, we must at the same time allow that God has an eternal love for sin, and that he is not infinitely good. The truth is, that as God has but one nature, he of course has but one object; and as his nature is goodness, his purpose is benign. He cannot therefore project a design, partly good and partly evil, as such an intention would prove that he is not of one mind, and that he can be turned. Were it possible for God to regard sin and holiness as final objects in his government, as they are infinitely opposed, each to each, he must be divided against himself; his kingdom could not stand; for what fellowship

hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial?

From what has been said, this conclusion is fairly deduced, that the things which are seen are temporal, but that the things which are unseen, are eternal; that we do not yet see all things subjected to Christ, but that he shall reign until all things are subdued unto him, and that then he shall be subject unto the Father, that God may be all in all.

ANOTHER BAPTIST CONVERSION.

DEACON JAMES GREEN has been expelled from the Baptist Church in Berlin, (N. Y.) for believing and advocating Universalism. The letter of exclusion, written by Elder Justus Hull, charges him with no immorality of conduct, no violation of covenant engagement, but simply with holding and vindicating principles which he deems heretical. *Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake. Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy; for behold, your reward is great in heaven.*

EFFECTS OF UNIVERSALISM.

A writer in the Christian Gazette complains that the Sabbath is contemptuously treated by some of his fellow-citizens, and particularly, that some butchers in the northern Liberties of the city of Philadelphia, have opened a market and erected stalls in their own yards, where they vend their meats on that holy day. They have been fined and some of them have been imprisoned, yet, in defiance both of God and man, do they continue their traffic, and publish, both in hand-bills and newspapers their determination thus to break the Sabbath-day. The writer attributes this and other daring and recent profanations of the Sabbath, to the spread of the demoralizing doctrines of universal redemption. If men are taught that there is no devil, no hell, no future punishment, it is not surprising that they should infer that there is no Sabbath and no need of public teaching on that day. It is well, however, that some are prompt and firm enough to meet the shame of being informers, and have the laws executed.—*Religious Intelligencer.*

The above piece contains an unfounded and illiberal charge against Universalism; unfounded, as there is not a fragment of evidence to support it; illiberal, as that heart must be uncharitable, that could fabricate and publish such a slander, and on conjecture too. As the writer appears to think a belief in the devil, in hell and in future punishment will induce people to keep the Sabbath, we hope such a belief has had a salutary influence on him, and that hereafter, it may not only incline him to regard days, but character.

We were astonished that Mr. Robins, editor of the Christian Secretary made the above piece his, by quoting it; but believing him a christian and a gentleman, we presume it was done inadvertently, and wait for an explanation; or conclude, that having discovered his mistake,

he will be more cautious hereafter in wounding the feelings of those, who, though they cannot agree with him in faith, would wish to live in charity with all men.

FACTS not conjectures.

We are continually told, that a *belief* in the doctrine of the salvation of all men, has a *tendency* to make men commit all kinds of *crime*. Let facts speak. The State Prison in this city contained, a few days since, 623 criminals of various faith and religion; but, NOT ONE UNIVERSALIST AMONG THEM ALL! The editor of this paper went through the various departments of this gigantic reservoir of depravity, where hardened wretches from every clime are congregated, and visited the cells of the most abandoned, who, to appearance, have made a trade of sin, and heard, from the lips of the delinquents, their confession, that they believed in the endless misery of the wicked!—*N. Y. Gospel Herald.*

Such facts need no comment; but they deserve more attention than volumes of conjectures and speculations concerning the probable influence of Universalism in any given case, and should teach those who condemn, to judge righteously.

RELIGION AND LUNACY.

GENEVA, (Switzerland,) July 18.

Our Lunatic Asylum and our Hospitals are filled with unhappy persons, of both sexes, whom religious fanaticism has deprived of their reason. Of late years we have had to deplore several suicides, proceeding from this species of madness, which the faculty, from constant experience, consider as the most difficult to be cured.—*Palladium.*

Can that be the religion of Christ, which deprives people of their reason and life? when he restored the lunatic to their right mind, and came, not to destroy life, but to save it. Can that be a blessing, which disqualifies for every enjoyment of this life, and fills with gloomy, with distracting forebodings of another? If religion lead to insanity and suicide, we deprecate its prevalence; but if it give the "soul's calm sunshine and the heart-felt joy," we pray for its universal diffusion.

A PRUDENT FATHER.

A gentleman brought his son to this city, a few days since, that he might attend the Grammar School; and on inquiring for a boarding-house, he was directed to as good a one as the place affords, but on learning that part of the boarders were Universalists, he not only concluded not to leave his son in such an exposed situation, but absolutely carried him home with him, to prevent all danger.

BIGOTRY.

That there is but one true way is agreed upon; and therefore almost every church of one denomination, that lives under government, propounds to you a system or collective body of articles, and tells you that is the true religion, and they are the church, and the peculiar people of God; like Brutus and Cassius, of whom one says, "ubiique ipsi essent, prætexebant esse rempublicam," they supposed themselves were the commonwealth; and these are the church, and out of this church, they will hardly allow salvation; but of this there can be no end; for divide the

church into twenty parts, and in what part soever your lot falls, you and your party are damned by the other nineteen; and men on all hands, almost, keep their own proselytes, by affrighting them with the fearful sermons of damnation; but in the mean time here is no security to them that are not able to judge for themselves, and no peace for them that are."—*Taylor's Sermon 'Via Intelligentia' from John, vii. 17.*

The spirit of true religion breathes mildness and affability. It gives a native unaffected ease to behaviour; it is social, kind, and cheerful; far removed from that gloomy and illiberal state of mind that clouds the brow; sharpens the temper, dejects the spirit, and teaches men to fit themselves for another world, by neglecting the concerns of the present.

ANECDOTE.

A Portuguese sculptor, who was suspected of free thinking, was at the point of death. A Jesuit, who came to confess him, holding a crucifix before his eyes, said, "Behold that God you have so much offended—do you recollect him now?" "Alas! yes," replied the dying man, "it was I who made him!"—[*N. H. Gazette.*]

POETRY.

[SELECTED.]

THE DEAD MOTHER.

A DIALOGUE.

Persons—Father and Child.

- F. Touch not thy mother, boy—thou canst not wake her.
 C. Why, father? She still wakens at this hour.
 F. Your mother's dead, my child—
 C. And what is dead?
 If she be dead, why then 'tis only sleeping.
 For I am sure she sleeps. Come, mother, rise:
 Her hand is very cold!
 F. Her heart is cold.
 Her limbs are bloodless—would that mine were so!
 C. If she would waken, she would soon be warm.
 Why is she wrapt in this thin sheet? If I,
 'This winter morning were not cover'd better,
 I should be cold like her.
 F. No—not like her:
 The fire might warm you, or thick clothes; but her,
 Nothing can warm again!
 C. If I could wake her,
 She would smile on me, as she always does,
 And kiss me. Mother, you have slept too long.
 Her face is pale—and it would frighten me,
 But that I know she loves me,
 Come, my child.
 F. Once, when I sat upon her lap, I felt
 A beating at her side, and then she said
 It was her heart that beat, and bade me feel
 For my own heart, and they both beat alike,
 Only mine was the quickest—and I feel
 My own heart yet; but her's, I cannot feel.
 F. Child, child!—you drive me mad;—Come hence, I say.
 C. Nay, father, be not angry—let me stay
 Here till my mother wakens.
 F. I have told you,
 Your mother cannot wake—not in this world;
 But, in another, she will wake for us,
 When we have slept like her, then shall we see her.

C. Would it were night then!

F. No, unhappy child!
 Full many a night shall pass, ere thou canst sleep
 That last long sleep. Thy father soon shall sleep it:—
 Then wilt thou be deserted upon earth,
 None will regard thee:—thou wilt soon forget
 That thou hadst natural ties:—an orphan lone,
 Abandon'd to the wiles of wicked men,
 And women still more wicked.

C. Father! father!
 Why do you look so terribly upon me?
 You will not hurt me.

F. Hurt thee, darling?—no!
 Has sorrow's violence so much of anger
 That it should fright my boy? Come, dearest come.

C. You are not angry then?

F. Too well I love you.

C. All you have said I cannot now remember;
 Nor what it meant—you terrified me so:—
 But this I know you told me—I must sleep
 Before my mother wakens—so to-morrow,
 O, father, that to-morrow were but come!

CHRISTIAN FORGIVENESS.

I will be even with my bitterest foe,
 Revenge exclaims, and then returns the blow.
 I'll be superior, should the Christian say,
 And kind forgiveness readily display.

MARRIED.

In this City, on Sunday evening last, by the Rev. John Bisbe, Jr. MR. DANIEL E. MORGAN, of Ellington, to Miss CAROLINE M. RANDALL of East-Hartford.

The following Books and Pamphlets may be had by applying at this Office.

KNEELAND'S Translation of the New Testament,	\$1 50
Do. Columbian Miscellany,	1 00
Do. Lectures,	75
BALLOU'S Notes on the Parables,	1 00
Do. Treatise on Atonement,	1 00
Do. Series of Letters,	1 00
Do. Eleven Sermons,	50
HYMN Book used at the Universalist Church in this City,	75
A luminous discourse on the "Coming of Christ," from 2 Thess. i. 6, 10, by Rev. J. S. THOMPSON, recently of the Methodist Persuasion.	3
A Discourse, delivered at the United States' Chapel, Springfield, (Ms.)—by David Pickering.	12
Sin against the Holy Ghost,—by Geo. B. Lisher.	10
Force of Prejudice,	20
History of the Inquisition,	12
A Discourse, delivered at the Universalist Church, in the City of Hudson, (N. Y.)—by D. Pickering.	12
"Truth Defended, or arguments against Atheism, Deism, Calvinism, and the doctrine of once in grace cannot be lost."—by Thomas V. Wells.	20

Subscriptions received for the Christian Telescope, published at Providence, R. I.—Also, for the Rochester Magazine, published at Rochester, N. Y.

THE RELIGIOUS INQUIRER

IS PUBLISHED EVERY OTHER SATURDAY MORNING,
 A FEW RODS SOUTH OF THE LITTLE BRIDGE, AT ONE
 DOLLAR PER ANNUM—PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

J. T. BEEBE—PRINTER.